



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we have an elaborate and interesting introduction in which the person of Babrius, the history of Greek fable, the language of Babrius and the history of the text are discussed. Mr. Rutherford's style is perverse and does not deserve the commendation of conciseness which a friendly critic has bestowed upon it, but at all events it is not dull, and the collation of the Athoan MS preserved in the British Museum gives a special scientific value to this edition. Between the Athoan MS and the Vaticanus Mr. Rutherford thinks there is not much to choose, nor does he consider Suidas much better authority than the two sources mentioned. For his recension of the text he claims the character of conservatism, but when he does introduce his 'own tentamina' he does so with the same confidence that marks every line of his work. They are not numerous and few of them commend themselves irresistibly.

The edition has four indexes: 1. Index Fabularum; 2. An English Index; 3. A Greek Index; 4. Index Scriptorum and a welcome 'Graecitatis Babrianae Lexicon,' due in great part to Mr. H. Duff, Fellow of All Souls College, and 'intended as an aid to the work which sooner or later must be undertaken, and to which so little has been done—the scientific Lexicography of the Greek language.'

Mr. Rutherford's 'New Phrynichus,' it seems, has already become a standard work of reference in England and his Babrius will extend the reputation gained by his previous labors. A little closer study of Chandler's 'Greek Accentuation' would have been of service to him, but on this point also an improvement is to be noted, though he writes γαυρή in the text itself (95, 21) and emends a passage (107, 7) with ἀμειβον.

B. L. G.

Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Constructionen mit $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$. Von Dr. JOSEF STURM. Würzburg: A. Stuber. 1882.

Dr. Sturm has done excellent service in his presentation of the historical development of the constructions of $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$, and while I could have wished that he had made some use of the article on $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ which appeared in this Journal, Vol. II, p. 465 foll.,¹ the coincidences are all the more gratifying to one who cares more for truth than for originality.

According to Dr. Sturm there are two principal periods separated from each other by sharp lines of demarcation. In the first period the use of $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ is developing, in the second the development is completed.

The first period, which means Homer and Hesiod, shows us $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ in its beginnings. The original construction $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ with the infinitive was already developed, but as subjunctive and optative were just reaching vitality in Homer, no fixed

¹ I refer only to the theoretical discussion, for I have since discovered that the statistics of my collectors—inexperienced young men—were far from complete. This defect I had hoped to make good ere now by the dissertation of Lüth, *De usu particulae $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$ qualis apud oratores Atticos fuerit*, Rostock, 1877, but I have not been able to procure a copy. It is some consolation to know that Sturm had done the work over again before Lüth's dissertation had reached him; but he has only given a summary and not the references to the passages, so that I cannot make good the deficiencies in Demosthenes, which excited my surprise, if not my suspicion. See my article (l. c. p. 483).

norm of infinitive use as contradistinguished from subjunctive and optative uses could be attained. Hence the infinitive could be used indifferently after negative and after affirmative clauses. *Πάρος* is used with the inf. as well as *πρίν*, but *πάρος* is dying out, is never used with the subjunctive, and does not appear in Hesiod. The very rare subjunctive constructions betray the old parataxis. In Homer *πρίν* never takes *άν* or *κέν*; it is still purely adverbial.¹ Hence it is not yet suited to introduce a dependent clause in the indicative. The required sense is reached by *έως* or by *πρίν γ' ότε δή*, the latter formula not appearing in the subsequent period.

The second period embraces all the other authors of the classical time to Plato inclusive. The conditional relation was felt more and more as the subjunctive was developed more and more. Consequently the infinitive was restricted mainly to the affirmative relation, and on the other hand the connexion with the conditional sentence became very close. Parataxis vanishes; *πρίν* like other conjunctions takes the particle *άν*, becomes a full conjunction and admits the indicative. The present infinitive is used more freely than in the first period, in which the aorist infinitive was almost exclusively employed. The perfect also comes in. The dawn of the new period is seen in Hesiod. In comparison with Homer the subjunctive is more frequently employed, and on the other hand the shadow of the old period falls here and there on Euripides and Herodotos.

In the second period Dr. Sturm distinguishes three groups. The first is represented by the writers of the New Ionic dialect. *Πρίν ή* and *πρότερον ή* are used not only with the infinitive but also with the indicative and subjunctive aorist. The optative is not found; the indicative is used only after negative sentences, and then the conjunction *πρίν* is always strengthened by the particles *γε δή* or *δή*. The present infinitive is rare.

The second group embraces the poets and Thukydides. *Πρίν ή* has vanished, not to reappear in our field of observation, nor do we find it in Attic inscriptions. The indicative is used after affirmative as well as after negative sentences. In Thukydides the particle *δή* is used only after affirmative sentences, except once.² The aor. opt. reappears. Theognis is the first to use it in assimilation. The subjunctive present occurs once in Thukydides, once in the fragments of the comic poets. The present and the perfect infinitive become relatively more common, the latter especially in Euripides and Aristophanes.

The third group is made up of Xenophon, the orators and Plato, and shows the following peculiarities: (α) *πρίν* with the indicative is used only after nega-

¹ The paratactic origin of *πρίν* with subj. cannot be denied. See the passages cited in L. and Scott's Lexicon (7th ed.). But it is hard to see how the construction can be purely adverbial throughout. Wherever *πρίν* is preceded by *πρίν*, *πρόσθεν*, *ού πω*, it is on its way to the conjunctive, and the difference here as elsewhere between Homer and later Greek is the difference between tendency and universality. *Πρίν* with the inf., the original construction, is itself often conditional, final.

² There is no discernible reason for this, and besides the statement rests on a sad blunder, the same blunder that Kühner made, as I pointed out l. c. p. 469. 1, 51, 1; 1, 118, 2; 3, 29, 1; 3, 104, 7 are negative and not affirmative. 7, 39, 2 and 7, 71, 5 show persistency which brings out the 'until' idea. See the passage from Aischines cited below. While correcting the faults of others, I must not omit to correct my own inadvertencies. In the article cited p. 469, 13 l. from bottom, for '7, 71, 5 . . . δειλύθη' read '3, 104, 7 . . . κατελύθη.' The false citation makes me contradict myself (p. 479, l. 3 from bottom).

tive clauses (except Aischin. i, 64), and never takes a particle (except *πρίν γε* X. Oik. 7, 7). (*β*) the indicative is most frequently used by Xenophon. In the Isokrates it is chiefly employed in *οὐ πρότερον ἐπαύσατο πρίν* and similar phrases. In Plato it is dying out before *ἕως*. (*γ*) In unreal sentences the indicative is found only in the orators and Plato. Euripides satisfies himself in two passages with the original infinitive. The present infinitive occurs with special frequency and reaches its height in Xenophon, and the present subjunctive and opt. are comparatively more common. (*δ*) Instead of *πρίν* we find for the first time *πρὸ τοῦ* with the infinitive. *Πρότερον ἢ* seldom does duty for *πρίν*, and is limited to the infinitive. (*ε*) *ἢ πρίν*, a new combination, emerges in Xenophon.

So much for the facts. As for the theory, Dr. Sturm argues against the explanation of *πρίν* with the inf. as arising from parataxis, and well he may, for it is sheer nonsense. The infinitive must be dependent, but how dependent? To the prepositional theory he is utterly opposed on the ground of the historical *salutis*. Such a construction would require the article, an old objection. Besides neither *πρίν* nor *πάρος* is used as a preposition in Homer. Sanskrit analogies, such as *purā* with the inf., suggested by Wilhelm and taken up by Monro, are made doubtful by Jolly's refusal to consider these Sanskrit genitives and ablatives as true infinitives. The omission of *ἢ* is extremely hazardous in view of the fact that Homer uses *πρίν ἢ* only twice and *πρίν* with the inf. 79 times. Schömann's parallelism between *πρίν* with inf. and *ἢ ὥστε* with the infinitive is condemned as unhistorical. *Πρίν* is fullblown — *ὥστε* at best emergent. Passing by other theories of which enough has been said in the article already referred to, we come to the one on which Dr. Sturm builds. The infinitive is the limit of *πρίν*. *Πρίν γενέσθαι* is 'sooner with reference to.' This is the explanation given by Wagner, the explanation adopted by Holzweissig, as one of the certain results of comparative grammar, and there is no denying that it does not require so wide a leap as the prepositional theory. And yet the parallels are not altogether satisfactory. In O 642: *ἀμείνων παντοίας ἀρετάς, ἡμὲν πόδας ἡδὲ μάχεσθαι*, in A 258: *οἱ περὶ μὲν βουλὴν Δαναῶν, περὶ δ' ἔστέ μάχεσθαι* the preliminary accusative saves the construction; ζ 230: *μεϊζονά τ' εἰσιδέειν καὶ πάσσονα* is nearer, and so is ν 33: *ἀσπασίως δ' ἄρα τῷ κατέδν φάος ἡελίοιο δόρπον ἐποίχεσθαι*, but the position of *πρίν* so far away from the verb, to which, on this theory, it really belongs, is unexplained. I cannot help thinking that Schömann, however wrong historically, was not so hopelessly wrong grammatically in his parallelism between *πρίν* and *ὥστε*. "Ωστε as Sturm himself has pointed out is in the same line of development, though later. We must always start with the final use of the infinitive, and if *πρίν* with the infinitive is to begin as 'prevention' and end as 'priority' we shall be nearer the truth than if we begin with some such abstraction as 'in Bezug auf.' But whatever the origin, the question of the prepositional feeling remains untouched. Nobody considers *ὥς* with the acc. a preposition, and yet it is in feeling a preposition. Nobody considers 'than' a preposition, and yet it behaves as such. We must learn to respect the conceptions of the users of language.

The combination *πρίν γ' ὅτε δῆ* would seem to postulate a quasi-prepositional use of *πρίν*, and one might be tempted to compare the history of *ἕως*, *μέχρι* (*ἄχρι*)

and perhaps even ἔσσε. Dr. Sturm sticks to the original parataxis, *πρὶν γε* belongs to the first part, *ὅτε δὲ* begins a new sentence. So M 436: *ὥς μὲν τῶν ἐπὶ ἴσα μάχῃ τέτατο πόλεμός τε | πρὶν γ' ὅτε δὴ Ζεὺς κῦδος ὑπέρτερον* 'Εκτορι δῶκεν, must be interpreted 'The battle hung in the balance—at least before: when now Zeus gave Hector the victory = until Zeus gave H. the victory.' To this it may be objected that if *πρὶν* had already become almost a formula with the infinitive, there is no reason why the analogy should not have been extended to the finite constructions.

As to the prevalence of the aorist infinitive in Homer, Sturm simply accepts what Cavallin had said about the tenses of the infinitive. We do not need to be told by Cavallin that the tenses of the infinitive have to do primarily only with the kind of time. That has been a common possession for several decades, and my objection to this statement is that the student is put off with a formula which he does not always know how to apply, and I think it well to give emphasis to the negative element of *πρὶν* in order to bring the use of the aorist inf. more clearly to the consciousness. The prevalence of the finite aorist after the negated *πρὶν* is simply in accordance with the general needs of the temporal sentence. Overlapping¹ action is less common than clear priority and posteriority. Hence *πρὶν ἄν* with the pres. subj. is rare, and Dr. Sturm has actually denied its existence in the tragic poets in spite of Sophokles, Phil. 1409.

Dr. Sturm defends the passage in Solon (36, 21): *οὐτ' ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον οὐτ' ἐπαύσατο, | πρὶν ἂν ταράξας πῖαρ ἐξέλη γάλα* on the ground that the author had in his mind a familiar proverb with the future or the optative with *ἂν* in the lead (*οὐ παύσεται* or *οὐκ ἂν παύσαιο*). This is a kind of *repraesentatio* and is the only possible explanation, but not satisfactory in an unreal sentence as I have said (A. J. P., I 458) where I suggested *πρὶν ἀναταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα*, or better *ἐξελεῖν γάλα*, referring to the very passage in Eur. Alc. 373 which Dr. Sturm has cited. I am glad to see that he has accepted Förster's *ἰκέσθαι* for *ἔκρηται* in Simon. Amorg. I, 12, a verse treated at length in my article cited (p. 468), though neither Förster nor Sturm has tried to account for the error.

I would add that the spread of *πρὶν ἢ* in late Greek seems to be due partly to the mechanical grammar of the post-classic period, partly to the influence of Herodotos. The final step, which we find perpetuated in modern Greek, the use of *πρὶν ἢ* with subj. in all classes of sentences, affirmative and negative, is not noticed by Dr. Sturm, although it might fairly be considered to lie in the line of development.

As I have previously intimated, the practical results of Dr. Sturm's treatise have in the main been anticipated, but it is one thing to have laid down the correct lines of usage, another to show the history of the construction with exhaustive proofs, and I should be the last one to withhold from Dr. Sturm the meed of praise for his laborious and in the main careful piece of work.

B. L. G.

¹ Take one of the rare imperfects. Dem. 9, 61: *οὐ πρότερον ἐτόλμησεν οὐδείς ῥῆξαι φωνῶν πρὶν πρὸς τὰ τεῖχη προσήσαν.* The positive expression would be *ἐπειδὴ . . . προσήσαν, τότε δὴ . . .*